

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/706,503	WETHERALL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephan F. Willett	2142	

All Participants:

(1) Stephan F. Willett.

(2) Grant Houston.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10, 28 August 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Previous ones, but we did not discuss the details of any particular reference.

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant had amended the claims a second time after my non-final rejection, thus I called the applicant to discuss why another amendment to only certain claims was filed in an effort to further prosecution. I did not recall that I had spoken with Mr. Grant in December, 2005, thus I specifically asked Mr. Grant a second time if I had called him. Mr. Grant indicated that I did not initiate the call to him in December, 2005 and he indicated that he included the interview summary as required by MPEP 713.04 and since he was amending the claims again. I believe Mr. Grant called me in this case to discuss the claims generally. I believe I provided my views of the claims and provided no further documentation since nothing of substance resulted from the interview in the case's prosecution, and I did not expect a subsequent amendment would follow. In our 8/10 discussion, the substance of the amendments discussed were made in the 8/28 filed amendment which I believe were made since I believed they would further prosecution. On 8/28 I indicated my previous indication of allowable subject matter has been withdrawn, and I asked them to file a supplemental amendment including the changes in the proposed examiner's amendment.